

**Monorail Review Panel
Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2003
Key Tower Room 2750**

Panelists

Jack Mackie
Mimi Sheridan
Don Royse
Cary Moon
Vlad Oustimovitch
Nancy Henderson
Nic Rossouw
Steve Sheehy
Blaine Weber
Dan Foltz

City Staff

John Rahaim
Kathy A Dockins
Layne Cubell
Ethan Melone
Newell Aldrich
Marty Curry
Dave Buchan
Donald Nelson
Peter Dobrovolny
Barb Wilson
Maureen Colaizzi
Vanessa Murdock

SMP Staff

Alan Hart (Consultant)
William P Baskus
Eileen Norton
Kristina Hill
Patricia Boies

SMP Consultants

Bryon Ziegler (Mithun)
Bill LaPatra (ZGF)
Deb Guenther (Mithun)
Melanie Davies (Swift & Co)
Barbara Swift (Swift & Co))
David Hewitt (Hewitt Architects)
Don Miles (ZGF)
Mahlon Clements (ZGF)
Lee Copeland (Mithun)

Public

Michael Herschensohn
David Durham
Kevin McDonald
Steven Cohn
Guy Maluda
Roger Gula
Mary Jo Porter
Douglas A Murdock
Ed Brighton
Barbara Perkins
Ari Kramer
David Talcott
Peter Hockaday
Roger Wagoner
Henry Aronson
Cindi Barker
Sandra Susuic
Marcus Stringer

The meeting began with introductions all around: first the Panel and staff, then other attendees.

Business

Adoption of Administrative Policies

John Rahaim gave an overview of the Administrative Policies he'd drafted based on the Design Commission Administrative Policies. All underlined text is information that has been added. All text that is stricken is information that has been deleted. Cary moved to approve the policies and Nic seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

Minute Approval

Blaine moved that the 5/28 meeting minutes be approved; Vlad seconded the motion. The minutes were approved with one abstention and no "nay" votes. Mimi moved that the 6/16 minutes be approved; Nic seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Introduction of New City Monorail Staff

John Rahaim introduced Cheryl Sizov, Urban Design and Planning Lead; Vanessa Murdock, Land Use Lead; and Maureen Colaizzi, Program Coordinator for the Panel. There are still two Station Area Planner positions to be hired.

Code Amendments

There were some questions about the code amendment hearing to be held July 22, which will address the permitting of the Monorail as a permitted project. The meeting will cover the approval process and some height and setback provisions. The topic is on the agenda for the July 21 Panel meeting.

Discussion

- Will (the Panel) offer recommendations to Council on the code amendments? *We're just advisory. It will be our choice whether or not we want to make a recommendation. The August 4 meeting will be Council's first opportunity to vote on the issue. Because it is on our agenda for the next meeting, we will have time to contact Council before they vote should we choose to give a recommendation. I (John Rahaim) will send out the code language via e-mail.*
- I have a question about the 6/16 minutes we just approved. They say the new photo and other simulations we requested would be ready by this meeting but they're not on the agenda. Council wanted something for two of the big three events (Folklife, Bite of Seattle, Bumbershoot), but if we're seeing nothing today it's too late for the Bite. *There must have been some confusion on the part of staff. We'll make sure it's on the agenda for the 7/21 meeting.*
- Will there be further discussion of Ethan's memo and how the Panel fits in to that? And how we are to take action with our review? Will we have the opportunity to discuss what's under our purview? *We're suggesting the Panel review many things that aren't under standard Commission review, so that's something we certainly should discuss. I'll get it on the agenda for a future meeting.*
- I just want to make sure we're clear on what our review authority is.
- Plus, we need more detail on Council's parallel action, specifically how our review/decision schedule precedes Council's decision schedule.

Discussion of Urban Design Work

We're not necessarily discussing the work itself today; primarily the scope. Four of the eight consultant teams are present: Mithun, Swift & Company, Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Partnership, and Hewitt Architects.

System-wide Design and Landscape

Lee Copeland, Mithun

Barbara Swift, Swift & Company

Mithun and Swift & Company are responsible for the overall urban design and landscape design, respectively. Because they are focusing on the larger context, they chose to observe other systems around the world to see what they could learn. Mithun has been working on taking input received at various meetings (community, etc) to create a statement incorporating all goals, principles, and criteria. We're looking at the scale level of the overall corridor, the neighborhoods within the corridor, the station areas, the stations themselves, the columns, and the street. We're looking at aesthetics, place making, function, and the environment.

We're also looking at how to address the entire corridor with request to sequential experience (e.g. bridge crossings, the iris system on 2nd Avenue compared to others). How does variation occur and what does that mean to each neighborhood? We need to determine how to express the nature of each individual neighborhood. We're also determining how the landscape will change sequentially and looking at the ecosystem of the corridor. How will the alignment be able to educate the public vis a vis environmental conditions?

The principle is what we apply to attain the goal. For example, if our goal is street-level relation, then we need to focus on connection with bus lines and pedestrian amenities. Another example is South Lake Union, where the streets are all asymmetrical. If we want to make it work, we need to provide the appropriate number of lanes for bus, bike, and drop-off parking, and coordinate the sidewalk with column footings. The criteria is specifically oriented to (e.g.) California Avenue, 2nd Avenue, etc.

Right now, our schedule is that we'll be developing our Goals/Principles/Criteria through August, with a draft at the end of August. The comment/review period will go through September, and final approval should be at the end of September. Segment team workshops will take place through mid-August, with a focus on graphics workshops and deliverables.

As we mentioned earlier, we've looked at other systems throughout the world, and in each case we're focusing on the following: scale of the urban fabric; scale of the structure; the type of system; joint development; station size; materials; whether or not it's sustainable; governance; and the impact on urban life.

In Jacksonville, the project is a true monorail, started in 1970 and operational in 1989. The system takes advantage of Jacksonville's rolling terrain. There is a hierarchy of sequence, basic materials were used, the capacity is fairly low (approximately 15 passengers per car), and the columns are about 20' high. We visited it on a Saturday, so we couldn't gauge its impact on urban life.

In Detroit, the project is a 35' inserted people-mover. It's a physical manifestation of community values and history (much like Vegas, below). The station is not in the right-of-way and is confusing and awkward (I think she meant to non-natives).

Miami's system is free and successful, but we didn't visit it so can't really report on it.

In Vegas, to use a theatrical term there is the "front of house" part of the city (the Strip) and the "back of house" part of the city. The Monorail definitely reflects community values as it extends this strategy. The columns are about 20' off the center of the guideway. The beams have a slight curve and the escalator arcs change the feeling of the system.

Vancouver's system is in two components: one completed in '86 for Expo and one completed in '99, so you have two generations of construction. The entire system has a good relation to the surrounding context. The station at Commercial and Broadway handles the transition from large to small very well. That station in particular was influenced by community involvement. The primary difference between Vancouver and Seattle is that Seattle's urban grain is much finer. In Vancouver, the stations become a catalyst for development; in Seattle, the alignment goes through neighborhoods which already have well-defined identities so the Monorail will need to accommodate that, not create it. Vancouver also had the Municipal Integration Fund, which was a pool of money that resulted in a number of outlying stations being built. Joint development held up the Millennium line.

What's clear in all solutions is that we need to keep the energy on the street, which extends to the issue of how the system is managed. Barbara then gave examples of personal experiences with different systems in relation to whether or not there was staff available to assist her.

The evolving neighborhood identity should be a thoughtful effort. The primary differences with Seattle's system are: we have a finely-grained urban fabric; we're using an existing street grid; and we have a simple organizational structure. This adds to the system's legibility and east/west connections then become vital.

So, we really need to look at the way the system meets the street. We've been charged to reach further than the examples we've seen. We're interested in integrating the landscape; there are few Monorail examples that do.

Discussion

- Thanks for your presentation. It feels good to see this kind of thought going into the project. The analysis was great; however, I still don't understand your commitment to make sure the principles

and criteria match what ends up being built. *Our first goal is to get the system built, but we also want excellent design. We're trying to get the best design, so we analyze, then prioritize. We want to make part of the design requirements in the RFP so we're up-front and center the whole way. We want to involve top-notch firms.*

- I do appreciate the photos, but you need to be fair with us showing Calatrava at-grade. (Images of) Calatrava may set expectations that can't be given. Is the "amoeba" in the drawing representative of the corridor? This reminds me of a discussion the Design Commission had: when is one "at the Waterfront"? Is it when one is on the west side of a building and can see the water? In the same vein, what is "the corridor"? How do we define it, especially the east/west branches? SMP & consultants need to be prepared to discuss who is responsible for maintaining the east/west corridor (fiscally and literally). *We do need to define it, but right now it's a rhetorical question. We are looking at it (the whole length of the system) as view sheds. When one is standing at the top of 15th, one may be able to see it, but how cognizant would one be of it? We're looking at the outer limit: little views, framed views. The perspective is open space, habitat, system, corridor. We won't know for a while who is responsible for it.*
- I know it will come; I just want you to think about it now.
- I think the "amoeba" is primarily the station. The alignment is the line, and it will have more impact than the station.
- I need a sense of the system-wide game plan: are the criteria imposed on the project by itself, or by the City? Could the criteria impose on the design?
- Yes, is what you do binding to the other design teams? *Input re: criteria also comes from the other design teams.*
- We need to look for consistency through all presentations. I agree with Barbara's statement about the importance of the keeping the energy on the street and Seattle's fine urban grain. What we need to keep asking ourselves is what do we value in Seattle and how is that reflected in the design of the Monorail?
- Yes, keep the positive energy on the streets and the negative energy away from stations. If the system can become an organizational mechanism for the negative energy on the street (signs, traffic, pollution), if it can improve that aspect, it will make the corridor better. *As the client, Mithun's principles are to guide the urban design work, so we appreciate the help.*
- Seattle has serious topography and two datum lines. The Monorail may have trouble responding to that and building a relationship to the topography. The original iris drawings had a lot of variance and that could lead to clutter.
- We need to move along. Are there any critical comments that need to be made before we take action?
- Are you looking at the zoning, also? *We're just planning the Monorail, not the city. We're working with the City, but it would be City consultants who would make those decisions.*
- The studies are simultaneous.
- How do you make sure the work (of different teams) works together? *We all work together so the best ideas come to the surface. The goals, principles, and criteria are developed as a group, and individual consultants are guided by Mithun.*
- Now I'd like to open the floor to public comment.
- There's been a lot of talk about neighborhood identity, but respect for the historic neighborhoods should go beyond that.
- Do you really think urban design and zoning are separate?
- I think he was talking about stations, which is separate from what Nic was talking about (station area).
- What about the compatibility of zoning in general? *It's the Monorail's responsibility to make it compatible.*
- The Monorail should integrate with existing zoning.
- Some changes might be necessary to accommodate it.
- But that wasn't part of the original effort? *At stations, yes; with Station Area Planning, no.*

- I think we're ready for an action (reads draft).
- I want to add that we need final documentation with a clear analysis of east/west branches showing the philosophy of responsibility and the fiscal path of responsibility.
- That's not the design teams' responsibility.
- We can make it less of a command.
- I don't know where else it should be handled.
- I don't think any of us do yet. Station Area Planning and Council approval will be included. The City and the Monorail will be working on it.
- What are the Monorail and the City doing in that regard?

Action

The Panel thanks you for your presentation and the lively discussion. We are greatly encouraged by the thinking and approach displayed in your work, particularly the emphasis on the monorail's relationship with the street and its effect on public life. We suggest you temper your inclination to inspire the public with images of great works with a realistic assesment of what the budget will afford, to avoid disappointment later. We look to the city to assess priorities and responsibilities for Station Area Planning work to ensure the identity of the monorail corridor is integrated into the City fabric. We recommend the City's urban designers analyze the streets that cross the monorail route to recommend how their identities will be developed or sustained. We will be looking to the City's team to incorporate these goals, principles and criteria into the project review and approval process, as well as into parallel planning efforts, so the project may best achieve the level of quality displayed here. We suggest you also explore how the monorail can organize and order the negative elements, or street clutter, along the route. We appreciate your intent to express Seattle's unique topography in thinking about the vertical alignment. We will continue to watch to see that the goals and principles are incorporated by other design teams. We also look toward the City's planning effort regarding the philosophy of responsibility and the fiscal path of responsibility for east/west branches.

Action by Cary; Paul Tomita seconded, and the action passed with one nay vote.

2nd Avenue Segment

Don Miles, Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Partnership

First of all, I just want to say that we appreciate the Panel's input, so we will leave plenty of time for that. Our work is interactive, not linear, so we inform the functional plan as we inform the urban design.

Our scope is to look at five station areas beginning with 2nd/Pike (surveying the retail core); 2nd/Madison (the library, ferries, and financial district); 2nd/Yesler (Pioneer Square, the Civic Center, the Light Rail tunnel, and again, ferries); Weller Street (King Street Station); and the Safeco Field station (stadiums).

We've identified some emerging themes: making connections (especially Weller St, Safeco Field); and a "great street theme for 2nd Avenue. In our analysis of 2nd Avenue, we're looking at views, connections, buses, memorable places, plazas, public art, active edges (existing and future), historic/civic buildings, lighting, paving, and reconciling visual clutter.

We did time lapse photography of each station area. The flow on 2nd Avenue is open. There is a lot of bus transit, but little car congestion. We've used the photos we took for these simulations. We asked ourselves what criteria would make 2nd Avenue a great street. It's function, pedestrian activity, the delight of the street, and simplification/expedition of construction.

2nd Avenue is open, airy, and active. It's a critical street for pedestrians. The free zone should be 10' wide (2 x 2), which should reduce pedestrian/vehicle conflicts. Sidewalk bulbs will do this as well by reducing the walking distance and slowing down right and left turns. We need to determine how to accommodate bus problems. We want to open access to stores by adding pavement, but we want to complement adjacent open spaces. There are some merchant zone issues. We have the opportunity to create a 3-D envelope (with merchants at station platforms). We're making the station a part of the street. We want transparency and a relationship to the street.

We're adding to the sidewalk width in order to reduce sidewalk clutter. Right now we're determining whether the trees should be aligned with the columns in order to think of the guideway as organic. Is it part of the architecture of the street wall or of the street?

The guideways have to be flat at the station, but can reflect Seattle's topography as they move away from the station. The guideway can be a potential source of illumination. It's important to introduce pedestrian scale lighting.

Looking at view sheds, we've seen that when the platform is lowered, the aperture is narrowed. If it's higher, there's more openness so there's actually a better view. The differences we're showing here are all based on the height of the platform, the guideway being on one side of the street vs. the other, eliminating the bike lane (which our time-lapse showed isn't used much), and making a wider sidewalk (adding 7').

There are also the options of building the guideway with the low-beam adjacent to the buildings, or the opposite with the high-beam adjacent to the buildings. The use of glass could create an atrium at street level. Curvilinear columns break down the scale. These photo simulations show the following options/variances: the guideway on the east side vs. the west side of the street; low-beam adjacent to buildings vs. high-beam. We also intend to look at east/west views, views from inside buildings, and pedestrian views walking down the e/w hills. (Locating the guideway on) which side (of the street makes) a better "gateway" as people move west down to the water? We're also trying to articulate the guidebeam to avoid creating a monolith.

Discussion

- I'd like you to talk about how to KEEP 2nd Avenue a great street instead of making it into one. How do you maintain the mix of elements that already exist there? *We want to add to the mix without creating what doesn't work. We don't want to introduce a Monorail station where the bus stops are and create a huge press of people. We want to build on the positive things, like eye-to-eye contact, and add to the excitement and activity.*
- Won't separating the Monorail and bus stops lessen the intermodal connectivity? *They'll be close enough.*
- One intriguing thing about the simulations, particularly the third down on the left, is the almost implied closure of the street, with the guideway acting like a cornice on a building. I think you need to introduce a level of order to the chaos on 2nd. I'm still concerned about a roller-coaster impact. *We assume the guideway maintains the same height alignment.*
- Will the upper & lower beams maintain their positions throughout the alignment (low always being low; high always being high)? *Yes.*
- Isn't there already a preferred alignment as to the east or west side of the street? *Yes, the west. Then isn't there already consensus for the stations? Regardless of the side, they'll serve the same function. At Weller and Safeco they'll be on the same level. I'd like to clarify that: the EIS is studying several options along 2nd and 5th.*
- The lower platform appears thinner. Will it be? *The platforms will be consistent in width.*
- The space above the lower platform could be open to the roof.

- What about technical aspects? Access/safety platforms? Bridges? *Our assumption now (based on Fire/Life Safety requirements) is that there will be an "escape" walkway on both levels.*
- Will it be made of grille work? Will it be transparent? *It's not even in the simulation. It will be added.*
- How wide did you say the sidewalk would be? 18'. So you intend to reduce the street width? Do you want a 25' sidewalk? *It varies on the opposite side of the guideway, but in all possibilities, yes, the street will be narrower.*
- By 4'? 5'. *The street isn't losing a travel lane, just some of its width.*
- What is the minimum reasonable sidewalk on the Monorail side of the street? 25' because of the setback requirements.
- I like the wider sidewalks, but there will be significant right-of-way improvement costs. Going from 18' to 25' will cost a lot of money. *The intent from the beginning was that we'd lose a lane, so the r-o-w improvement costs are included. What's been shown is consistent with what we've thought from the beginning.*
- We'd be losing a bike lane and gaining pedestrian space, but that's still an unresolved issue. The time-lapse photography doesn't show peak hours when there are more bicyclists there. The bike lane removal is not a fait accompli.
- Are there utility corridors underneath? *Yes, they're there. We need to take a detailed look at the utility issue. We'll be threading our way through. SMP took the worst-case view. It's our goal to find the best-case. We've got good ideas, but we're not quite there.*
- I like the creative lighting, but I cannot support the removal of a bike lane. I think you need to focus on helping more people share the space. 2nd Avenue seems empty to me. You should look at ways to make it more efficient.
- Is it going to be on the east side and is it a stacked guideway? Should we assume that from the photo simulations? *There are still other options on the table.*
- I'd like to see those. *The analysis is east/west.*
- I would have expected it to be side by side. I want to see more evidence that there's less view blockage with a stacked guideway.
- We talked about using the "tulip" columns through downtown at another meeting . . . *The problem with the tulip is that it goes up and down.*
- We talked about doing a transition once. *The roller coaster effect would come from changing configurations. The tulip transition is quite long. You need to swing out and down in order to transition to side by side.*
- What if you just kept it through the downtown? *It's a 1200' to 1500' transition.*
- Contrary to what Vlad thinks, I don't think the guideway creates a cornice effect in that simulation. I prefer the higher-level beam to be closer to the building with a natural perspective.
- I agree with Jack on the visual simulations. We need views down the cross streets. The pedestrian bridge at the WSCTC had a major view impact. To give an adequate analysis we need to see those view corridors.
- The staggered height seems to give less blockage in some cases, but more in others.
- You should have a discussion with property holders. A side-by-side alignment will have impact on only one floor, but stacked will have an impact on two floors. *We have talked to the property holders.*
- I like the guideway pedestrian lighting, but it doesn't need to be so extreme. Just focus on the pedestrian level where it's needed.
- Any public comment?
- Yes, so we'd be losing one lane of traffic and the bike lane? *No, we'd lose parking and the bike lane.*
- If the alignment is on the east side, will it need to cross over to the west side at Yesler? *Yes, it will. We'll provide a visual of that. The visual simulations just came off of the machine today. We will have more.*

- That brings up a salient point: if you first want to enhance the energy of the street, you really need to continue to explore place-making. Expanding the sidewalk to 25' will be great if we have the accoutrements to do that.

Action

We thank Zimmer Gunsul Frasca for their excellent presentation, and appreciate the focus on making 2nd Avenue a “Great Street” while enhancing some of the great qualities we believe it already has. We support your desire to make it a better pedestrian environment – particularly in the area of making connections and creating memorable places. With regard to the monorail infrastructure, we encourage you to focus on an option that has less visual impact and light blockage, and we need to see more analysis and graphic visualization. We like the sculptural quality of the supports, but are less enthusiastic about a stacked guideway. We appreciate your inclusion and analysis of the lighting needs. We would like to see photo simulations showing views from east and west, and where the guideway needs to cross to the other side of 2nd Avenue at Yesler. We’d like to see a more creative approach to the streetscape and pedestrian environment. We feel the iris configuration needs more analysis. Although the idea of enlarging the sidewalks is enticing, we are concerned about the potential removal of a bike lane and would like to hear more information from the bike consultant. We encourage you to continue to explore the opportunities to expand, expose, and enrich the pedestrian environment with a particular focus on the opportunities for place-making.

Action by Blaine; Paul Tomita seconded, and the action passed with one nay vote.

Stewart Street at 5th Avenue

David Hewitt, Hewitt Architects

I just want to start off by saying these are drawings, not decisions. There is still significant flexibility in what we've got here.

2nd & Stewart is the lowest part of the guideway, so our first challenge is how we deal with the intersection. 5th Ave is flat and low-scale with street trees and is a good mix of elements. The Denny/5th transition and the alignment through EMP are also under our purview. We're also studying Westlake (reviewing desire lines) and Bell (because it's a Green Street). We need to look at: the impacts on the street; what's most desirable; and if we want a transition, or to keep things the same. We need to determine how tall the guideway will be and how it will work.

With the Bell Street station, common reactions we got from the community is that it's an urban neighborhood, idiosyncratic, diverse, has good art and scale; safety and light. Having retail at the station is not of great importance to the neighborhood. What they want are expressive forms, rational design, and cutting-edge transparency.

There is a lot of pedestrian traffic in Belltown, with east/west being different from north/south. We want the station to come back and connect to Belltown and are considering open space and/or private development to help make that happen. There are tremendous differences between using the iris, center, or side alignments. The iris appears to reduce the most negative impacts.

We've included the façades on the 5th Avenue elevation so you can see the relation to building height. We've also plotted the street utilities on 5th. Once the information is sharpened, we can make a more rational response. With a center alignment, we've shown both parallel beams and iris beams; with the western alignment we just have the iris. We're looking at each possibility: if we have 90' of right-of-way and remove one lane, that gives us 35' of sidewalk. If we have one parking and three traveling lanes, we have 24' of sidewalk.

When looking at variations (both the iris and the parallel configurations), we're focusing on column spacing, intersections, and possibly enhancing the view by varying the guideway. We think it's possible to avoid doing any destructive work on existing buildings. We're also considering the guideway as it leaves Broad on its way to 5th. Our process is a system of investigation.

For our Westlake work, the drawing shows the EIS alignment but we are still looking at all of them. The input we've gotten from stakeholders and the community is that they want multi-modal connectivity, they want the system to be a facilitator, they want it to draw people in, be sleek, be a gateway to retail, and a feature for tourism. Both options we're looking at right now have opportunities for a glass station.

Discussion

- I especially appreciate the feedback you've gotten from the stakeholders and community, since 5th Avenue is the only street in the city that currently has a Monorail. Have you heard anything from them that indicates a preference for either a center or side alignment? *No one has made that point.*
- You've shown the columns as part of the sidewalk or a part of the street. What about part of the parking lane, with cars being able to park in between the columns? *That would be great for bus pull-outs, but we'll be looking closer at it next week. A "great street" is a goal for all of us. We want to promote economic development. Higher, lighter, with street amenities . . . these are the most important elements.*
- By the Fisher Building, there are columns in the parking lane and no one cares for that two-block area. It's worth going down and taking a look. It goes back to what Barb said about community values. We need to make sure there's someone doing maintenance if we make those decisions. Also, at 5th/Bell there's a petition going around that two businesses in particular be left alone. I encourage you to look at that. *We are.*
- Can you show us what the turn will be at 2nd/Stewart? Will you need to cross the street there in order to make the turn? *We'll need to see that.*
- Potentially, we could have huge ugly vents. *We can make progress by eliminating vents. Our goal is no vents.*
- Why is an eastern alignment not part of the scope? *We'd get more sunshine. West/center or west alone will cause more shade. I don't know why the east side is off the table. I'll look at that.*
- Future lines show connections north of Denny. How will you accommodate the transition structure? *NBBJ is studying that aspect of the alignment.*
- I appreciate the rigor of this comparative analysis. 5th & Stewart is a very confusing intersection, so I'd encourage you to use this opportunity to make it more legible. Also, explore the pedestrian environment.
- I'm overwhelmed by the information. It's nice seeing two firms work together to present this. I particularly appreciate the drawing of the guideway juxtaposed against the building so we can see the impact on the buildings. I'd like to see the impact on a park bench, so we need to see some eye-level views. Maybe the supports can be different to respond to the neighborhood. I encourage you to think in general terms and am anxious to get to that level of detail. I appreciate the detail of the nodes and stations, and encourage more of that.
- *We also have an east/west view, and are doing a 20' model! (laughter)*
- *We'll do a 50' model! (laughter)*
- The diagram that relates to the rest of the city is good. Regarding the iris, something that will be used system-wide is still a very serious question. At the joint Design/Planning Commission meetings we held, we said that it was very important that the alignment maintain a system-wide identity. ZGF('s work) has a lightness that's appealing. *We're looking at other options tomorrow. We may add street lights/wires to make it more dynamic.*
- Early on there was some discussion that we haven't heard in relation to all options: fire egress. What technical criteria are being discussed? *An open mesh walkway. It will add an element to the guideway that we feel needs to be a point of interest; almost like filigree. A bar will come out every 20' to support the walkway. The visual simulations need to reflect it; it's basically a fire escape, not a true walkway.*
- Does it need to touch down or will it just go to the next station? *Just to the station.*

- The Design Commission, which we are part of, is not prone to look at skybridges. Should we send a clear message about our feelings toward skybridges?
- I think it's safe to say none of us are crazy about skybridges.
- But the primary reason skybridges are a bad thing is because they take people off the street. I'm less concerned about that in this instance because if we're creating bridges, it's in order to activate the street. Our goal is to provide solutions that keep people on the street and also serve the Monorail.
- I just wanted to take the pulse of the group.
- I'm concerned about visual obstruction (references Minneapolis as an example).
- Downtown retailers think that an upper-level connection to Westlake is vital to the mall.
- Any further discussion?
- It's nice to have some basis for deliverables in a coordinated, presentation format.
- That's a good point, but I think it's outside of this action.
- Yes, it is. Anything related to this action?
- I'd like to receive booklets of these presentations so we have something to refer back to.
- Also a good point, but not part of this action.

Action

We thank you for presenting your work so far, and are supportive of your direction. We like the rigor of the the comparative analysis of alignments and column locations, and suggest you add an east-side alignment to your review too, focusing on street life and showing the pedestrian-level experience. We also appreciate the detailed analysis of the station areas and how they will function. We recommend you review the approach in the Mithun/Swift presentation, and focus more analysis on the spaces under the monorail, and public life. Show us the pedestrian experience of 5th Ave, and how to make it a great street. We recommend you explore creative wayfinding techniques at the 5th and Stewart station, to identify ways to clarify what is already a confusing and disorienting intersection. As this neighborhood has expressed a desire to support small businesses and promote its existing creative values, we suggest you approach the alignment decision with this in mind. We have a generally negative view of skybridges in this city, and strongly encourage you to study at-grade and below-grade connections to Westlake Mall as well. We recommend you review the turn at 2nd and Stewart in detail to help determine if the 2nd Avenue alignment will work better on the east side, and then bring visual simulations of that turn.

Action by Cary; seconded by Paul and passed with one abstention.

John thanked the Panel for staying late and said there was a lot of stuff for staff to do before the next meeting, including getting a larger meeting room, nameplates, and thinking about having longer or more frequent meetings. Items for the next agenda include Seattle Center simulations, code amendments, follow-up on other urban design segments, and Ethan's schedule memo.

- We need to approach the next level of detail with Ethan's memo.
- We also need to decide what we really review.
- "Schedule" is a broad term.
- When will the Panel approve the memo?
- Right now I'd say the direction is promising.
- The segments are broken up, but we see it all. We look at what makes this a continuing piece of civic architecture.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05.